

that, while it is not the business of schools to undertake this work, it is our business to see that it is done by those who are best fitted to do it outside the schools. It is possible for us to bring pressure to bear upon the parents by making it clear that if unseemly talk takes place in school owing to the ignorance of a child, the school authorities will feel bound to expel that child. Few, if any, parents face such a possibility, and none I think would run such a risk were they aware of it. There is among school masters and school mistresses a general consensus of opinion that unwholesome talk emanates from those who are ignorant and not from those who have been properly instructed at home. Parents might also be helped in a somewhat difficult task by the school authorities arranging for a lecture to be given to them by a thoroughly competent lady doctor, such as Dr. Scharlieb, who is able to judge the best way of approaching the subject with children. I know that in many cases such a lecture would be greatly valued.

My second suggestion is that if anyone in school is obliged to make up for the deficiencies of the parent, the best person to do so would be the lady doctor who acts as medical inspector. Every doctor is accustomed to the hard task of giving information on matters of kindred difficulty, and knows well how much or how little should be said. The child would recognise that it was part of the doctor's work and when the facts had been explained the moral purport of them could be treated by the head mistress, as shown above.

DISCUSSION.

DR. HAYWARD (Educational Department, London County Council) remarked that during the last thirty or forty years a number of isolated attempts had been made to improve moral education in the schools, including attempts at instruction in civics, courtesy, temperance, kindness to animals, patriotism. Those attempts were to him significant as indicating a certain lack of comprehensiveness in the existing systems of moral education, because all the schools in the country were supposed to devote forty minutes or more every morning to a consideration of the problems of life in an adequate manner. Yet in spite of that, these separate various attempts had been made, of which eugenics was the last and one of the most important, to improve the moral education of the scholars. The obvious implication was that although for forty years we had had a system which avowedly dealt with the great

problems of life, it had not done so actually. He would object to any further snippy attempts to make up for the deficiencies in our system. Even if to-morrow the Board of Education were to order that eugenics, or sex hygiene, should be included in the school curriculum, that would only be one question out of many, and the whole question of moral education would still remain unsolved. And there would be a clamouring on the part of the advocates of other schemes for equal treatment. Therefore, it was necessary to look beyond the subject of eugenics, however important that was, and ask whether, in view of the fact that a new Education Bill of wonderful comprehensiveness would be brought in before many years were past, the general scheme of moral training was being adequately dealt with. He believed English people made themselves ridiculous by constantly dabbling with isolated questions, while at the same time refusing to co-ordinate one question with another. The man in the street naturally asked, why this subject and not others also? And the teacher, from his standpoint, asked why he should be required to teach this subject and not others which he regarded as equally important. He therefore suggested that there should be a scheme which should include all these essentials, and that an attempt should be made to cover them during the forty minutes of the day's work to which he had alluded.

The essential element in human nature was its plasticity and educability. What was it that caused the cessation of religious persecution, and the abolition of witchcraft? No one believed that that disbelief was due to heredity; it was simply a result of the progressive advance of human culture, which had been handed down from one generation to another, through books, schools, and word of mouth. He thought the Eugenics Society set a wrong philosophy going when it laid stress on heredity without fully recognising what might be done by an improved system of education. He suggested that a deputation should be appointed to approach the Board of Education, and ask them to call a conference of competent educationalists, and set them to work, for two or three years at least, in drawing up a scheme rich in illustrative material, which could be submitted to schools to be used in the best way. Teachers needed guidance, and they deserved to be supplied with the best teaching material which could be obtained. When that was done, teachers could be safely left to carry out the task assigned to them.

DR. CHRISTINE MURRELL said that if she had rightly sensed the feeling of the meeting they were roughly agreed on one or two main points. One was that the subject divided itself naturally into two, possibly three, sub-divisions. One was the question of pure nature study. That, the vast majority of speakers had agreed, could adequately be taught in the ordinary science classes, without any undue emphasis, and, of course, without any undue shame. That was essential. It must be dealt with as part of the business of the day. The more intimate part she thought practically everybody who had spoken had agreed in thinking unsuitable for class teaching. At that point one got back to the right position of the parent, the mother particularly. Her particular duty was to make the young child, especially the girl, aware of life as it existed in society. But what was

the particular problem? Nobody had yet touched on the point that the vast majority of the mothers felt themselves incompetent at present to undertake such teaching. If the mothers were not fully aware of the right things which they should say to their daughters, the idea that they were not the proper persons to teach them should be encouraged. They wanted mothers to feel that this was a question which needed careful handling. It was right that they should have a serious idea of their responsibility in introducing the subject to their children. Therefore she counselled her hearers not to be too busy about educating the child, and to give more attention to educating the parent. The children were collected in hundreds and thousands in schools and so could be conveniently taught, but it was more important, though harder, to get the parents interested. All would be agreed that the teacher was not entitled to approach the children on this question without the permission of the parents. Another matter was that all here were not secondary school teachers. The question was very admirably dealt with by Miss Faithfull and Mr. Badley from the point of view of the teachers in secondary schools. But the problem was a different one in the elementary schools, for there the teachers had to deal with amazing social problems in the case of individual children under their care, with many children who, from the practical point of view, had no parent. If it were not so pathetic, it would be funny to hear some of the speakers who had been talking about the delightful atmosphere and careful observation of the mother, and how she would know about the individual character of her separate girls, and how she would deal with them. But among the poorer classes in the elementary schools, one found one such parent in a hundred, or perhaps they were even rarer. Children in the elementary schools had these problems coming before them without seeking them; there were girls exposed to dangers and evils which no girl ought to have to face. In some cases teachers, like mothers, felt themselves not competent, or well enough informed about the snares of the world to deal with the matter. She had been asked specially to put that point of view, and to tell the meeting what the County Council did. Feeling the difficulty of the question three years ago they instituted tentatively three simple lectures for teachers only. They wondered very much if there would be twenty teachers in London who wanted them. But instead of that the numbers ran into hundreds. Some people said they attended because of evil curiosity. But that was really too absurd. It was human and natural to want to know what one's body was like, and then to want to know what were the evils of the world around. The result of the discussion at that conference came to those two points: First of all, they had to try, even though it meant great trouble, to get at the parents, and try to show them in the first place what the evils were and how they could be approached, and how the subject could be taught; and secondly, to make themselves, as teachers, aware of the points, so as to be in a position to teach them. She felt very pleased when Miss Faithfull mentioned the medical inspector, because it made one feel that that officer was of some use. Several head teachers had come and asked her to deal with those points in the schools, because the medical officer had such a tremendous advantage. She was not always in the school, and after she had done her teaching she went away.

MR. H. V. PLUM (Kelly College, Tavistock) said he had not prepared any special remarks on the subject, because until he came to the meeting and heard exactly what was the point of view before the gathering he had not a clear conception of what would be discussed. He had given up two days' work in a far corner of Devon to attend the conference. Miss Faithfull said no one had yet dealt with this problem in schools, but from that he dissented, and he claimed to have done it himself in his own sphere. He was convinced that the only way to carry out the desire in this respect was to speak personally to the boys as a friend. For that reason it was very important to educate the parents. When the parent had done nothing of the kind it was very difficult to speak to a boy on the subject when he first came to the school, and he supposed it was the same in the case of the girls, because the schoolmaster (or schoolmistress) was not recognised by the pupil as a friend. Only when that barrier had been removed could such subjects be dealt with satisfactorily. Therefore in order to keep the schools clean and the boys and girls pure, the parents must be approached and educated on this subject. This society could call parents together and lecture to them, telling them how these matters ought to be dealt with. He did not see any difficulty provided the right sort of people could be got to speak to them, and give them a definite statement as to the way in which the matter should be broached. It might appear a large thing to say, but he claimed to have dealt with it himself. His efforts had been directed to getting the boys to live good lives, and keep clean and play the game. He entertained very definite views on several of the points which had been raised in the proceedings of the conference. One of them was that there must be no class teaching of any sort or description on this subject. He was quite sure it could not be dealt with in a sufficiently definite and satisfactory way in classes, and if it were dealt with in any way except individually it was inadequate, and probably led to much objectionable conversation afterwards. Again, there must be no lecturing, and for much the same reason. He was quite sure personal influence was the most important factor of all.

MISS WOOD (Headmistress, Cambridge Training College) said she did not know that what she would have to contribute would be original, but she wished to say how glad she was that an opportunity had been afforded for the discussion of this question, as she felt more and more how important it was from the training college mistress's point of view. She referred specially to the standpoint of teachers who were going into secondary schools, who, she felt, were so ignorant of the dangers which beset their pupils, dangers which were present also in day schools apart from boarding schools, as to the kind of communication which might be made by one pupil to another. It was very difficult, unless those dangers were known beforehand, for the teacher to be on her guard, and to know how to deal with the problems. She, therefore, came hoping to derive much help from the meeting, and she felt sure all present would feel they had had such help from hearing the experience of people who were taking this matter to heart, and dealing with it courageously. She thought already a certain clue had been obtained on the matter of instruction. She did not agree with Dr. Hayward, who referred to the question as if it were only one among many; it seemed to be so universal a subject that it came into the

experience of every single person, and therefore could not simply be regarded as one subject in a series. The right course was to consider the enormous importance of the subject, and not allow it to be put on one side. We were all suffering from defective education on the whole question, a defect which most people were now deploring. One could already feel that a change was coming, and when one attended a conference of this kind, and heard the matter aired and discussed, one felt what a relief it was to have the topic brought fully into the light of day. The fact that nothing was being done systematically in teaching the subject would tend, in itself, to make people who were being educated think of it as something which should be kept dark, or even as something to be ashamed of. It was impossible to prevent that sort of negative effect taking place if it were left to take its own chance. And there was a positive evil which others had touched upon. In the absence of proper teaching the knowledge would come from the pupil's own fellows, and it was never communicated by the best, it was always those who had not the purest minds who talked about such subjects. That constituted a fearful danger which all who had anything to do with schools must be aware of. She, therefore, said emphatically that those responsible for training pupils could not look on and let that sort of thing take place without making an effort to prevent it. To-day some clue had been given as to what ought to be done. The great difficulty appeared to be that one could not address classes on the subject, because the matters were so intimate, in so far as they were personal and individual. But there was the scientific and impersonal side of the question which could surely be brought in to a certain extent in school instruction. The personal side should be dealt with by the parent, and quite individually. She fully endorsed what others had said, that it was the parents to whom one should try to appeal. There was one other side of the eugenics idea which impressed her, namely, the whole idea of the relation and the feeling of one sex towards the other. There was need for sound common-sense teaching on what those relationships should be.

Miss Bonwick said she thought all were agreed that education, at least in school work and life, was a means, or an attempt, towards preparing the children for future life. And the whole of the questions connected with the bodily functions, the sex relations, and marriage were of such vital importance that she felt that if they were neglected the teacher was seriously failing in her duty towards the children. She was glad to note the agreement as to the parent being the best person to tell the truths of life to the child. That, of course, was provided that one had the ideal parent. She was so glad to hear Dr. Murrell point out the incompetence and unwillingness of a large majority of the parents, at least of the working classes. And she hoped she might be pardoned if her remarks took a personal turn, but that would have the advantage of keeping her more closely to the point. She had tried as far as possible, and she knew she had somewhat succeeded, to overcome the difficulties of direct sex teaching in class in an elementary school. She had found that the difficulty in regard to the parents could be quite easily overcome, by first of all sending out to them a typed letter, in which, more or less directly, the importance of the subject was brought home to them. And those

parents were invited to come to a meeting at the school, where they were promised further details as to how the question would be dealt with in speaking to their children. Her experience was that the mothers responded gladly to that, and after hearing what was told they were very emphatic in their approval of what was being done and proposed to be done. They were given an indication of the terrible temptations which beset girls and boys at the present day, and were shown how it was proposed to introduce the subject to the children gradually. One after another stood up after the address and said they only wished it had been done before. Some of them confessed that as they had not had the teaching themselves they did not feel competent to speak to their own children about it. Then came the course of lessons, and they should be taken, she maintained, in a different way from what had been suggested. She did not think the subject should be regarded as a separate one from all others. The children should not be taught that this was something quite different, something that they must think differently about. She thought it should be brought forward gradually and naturally, so as to disarm any feeling of mystery, or horror, or shame, and also to discourage any morbid curiosity and unseemly conversation afterwards. She knew her girls very well, and she claimed that after her talks there had been no unseemly conversation, except in the case of one girl who had unfortunately had a very bad past. The method carried out in her school was that first, while the children were of tender age, in connection with nature-study lessons, they were taught to reverence life, to understand in an elementary way the wonder and beauty of the propagation of life in the plant world, and later they were led on to the animal world. Having understood the main principles of the wonder of life, they were ready to take, more or less as a matter of course, only as something more beautiful and more wonderful, the actual story of human life. And that stage they reached when they were about 11 years of age. She found that the girls took it quite naturally; there was no evidence of great shock, or surprise, such as had been hinted at by some speakers. She did not think teachers should be compelled to teach this subject; instruction in it should be only given, in her opinion, by those teachers who were anxious themselves to give it in a natural and gradual way. She suggested that the headmistress should use great discretion in her choice of the teachers for the purpose. She emphatically did not think it should be in the hands of medical inspectors, either men or women, not because she thought they were incompetent, but because she felt that they were not in sufficiently sympathetic, and personal, and intimate touch with the children. She wished everyone understood the hard life that a medical inspector had who had to examine children by the clock. It was, of course, impossible, in a short speech, to deal with all the details one would like to bring before such an audience as this. She would, therefore, be very pleased to answer any questions which might be sent her through the Secretary.

She had been asked why she would advocate the giving of knowledge of a sex character to children at so young an age as 11 years. Her reasons were, first, because those who, like herself, had worked in the slums of London, and had to do with the children of the working classes, realised that there was a continual

and increasing danger in our midst, and there was a strong desire to provide the little ones with a method, or a power, of self-protection against it. She had had in her own school very terrible and sad cases which she felt would not have arisen had the children known a little more about themselves, about the great facts of life, and its mysteries, and about the respect and reverence which they should have for their own bodies. Her second reason was that the knowledge so given might forestall the wrong impression and conception which was so prevalent in the minds of the young, both boys and girls. She expected that every teacher knew that during lessons, such as those of Scripture or literature, when certain phrases raised enquiry in the child's mind, there passed round the class, or a section of it, a cunning grin, which meant, "Ah, we know all about that, and it is something to be very much ashamed of." That was also rather amusing, but there was no doubt that attitude of mind must be disastrous to the true sacred position of marriage in the national ideal. It was desirable, if possible, to give the children the truth in a pure and accurate way, so that they might feel that these wonderful facts were beautiful and holy; so that they might feel there was nothing unnatural or wrong connected with sex, but that it was rather the divine method of pressing forward the progress of the race. That was learnt by the children in their very early stages in the schools, through their nature-study lessons, and if she had left a wrong impression in the mind of anybody she would like to remove it.

She had no intention of turning the nature-study lessons into moral lessons, or to let such a lesson be a mixture of two elements of education. Her intention rather was that it should be a preparation in that the children should learn to understand the laws and principles of the propagation of life, that they should learn reverence, wonder, love, admiration for all these wonderful principles, and that thus they should naturally, almost of their own accord, jump to the application of the natural laws which they had there learned when they came to think of the human body itself.

The question of the difficult parent had been brought to the notice of the conference several times. It was admittedly a difficulty, but by no means an insuperable one. She had referred to the gathering of the parents together in order that they might be addressed on the subject of the introduction of sex teaching in the schools; but, of course, all the parents could not be got on one occasion to such a meeting; so what about the others? She had tried one method, which, she believed, got over the difficulty to a very large extent. In the letter which was sent out to every parent she gave the opportunity for an expression of a wish to withdraw the child or children from such instruction, but said she thought it very unlikely they would wish to withdraw them, when they realised that the children would, in most cases, find out the facts in one way or another, and that it was better that they should learn about such things from those who were capable of teaching them properly, and would deal with exact facts. Four or five parents out of 400 came to the school personally to protest against the giving of that kind of instruction; but in every case, after a personal talk and explanation, and putting the position to the parent, the difficulty was overcome, except in a few cases where the

mother said the real objection came from the father. In those cases the children were given some work to do in another class room, and there was no fuss made of the matter at all. When a father or mother applied for permission to have a child admitted to the school, they were again given a letter about the subject, and were personally invited to the school to talk the matter over with her if they wished to do so. In some cases they had done so, and that got over the difficulty of any objection in the future. Of course, it was well known that custom was the strongest method of wearing away obstruction and prejudice, and by degrees parents would get used to such instruction being given; they would see the good which came of it, as many had told her, and the parental objection she believed would be entirely removed. With regard to this parent difficulty, she would say, by all means get at the parent if one could; but one must never allow oneself to forget that the children now in the schools were the parents of the future, and when this knowledge had been imparted to them, they would best know how to approach their own children, and give them this beautiful and sacred knowledge.

She had been asked how she proposed to bridge the gap between the ordinary nature-study and the story of the actual human birth. That could be done in one of two ways. In her own school it was done by following a four-year course of nature-study by a three-year course of what they called "health and home knowledge," and it was in relation with these latter lessons that the special instruction came in, and quite naturally, without any fuss, a point she would again emphasize. Another method was to take the opportunities which occurred in every school to any teacher who was wide awake, in connection with the ordinary school life, or the incidents which arose, especially, as far as her own experience was concerned, in connection with Scripture and literature lessons. That could be made the occasion for supplying the children with the needed knowledge in a natural way.

An important matter was as to how to avoid any improper gossip or conversation after the children had been having such lessons. The whole question of marriage and birth was so sacred, so deep in the heart and soul, that they did not speak of it more than there was need, and, indeed, even she found it very difficult to speak satisfactorily on it when she knew that in times past so large a proportion of people had been brought up to think that the whole question was disgusting or wrong. But they had no business to think in that way about a subject which was so sacred and beautiful. To indicate to the children how it should be regarded, she gave them an illustration. She asked them to imagine that someone they loved very much indeed died; they did not go and blazon it abroad to all whom they met, even strangers; but rather, when the name came to their lips it was spoken in a hushed whisper, full of reverence and love. In just such a way, she told the children, they should regard this sacred subject of marriage and the love which led to it. She felt quite sure that placing the matter to them in that way had obviated the undesirable talk together afterwards.

The question of the attitude of public opinion had been dealt with; it had been said at this conference that this kind of instruction could not be given in the schools because public opinion was not ready for it. Her view was that they would never make any progress at all in any-

thing if they waited for public opinion. Public opinion was won over most of all by successful experiment, and she had felt—and she was being proved to have been right—that when the parents saw that no harmful results ensued from having the main facts put before them frankly, public opinion would come out, in the long run—perhaps in the short run—on their side. She felt that the teachers—and she spoke for many women teachers, and some men teachers, in Brighton at all events—were ready and eager to take up their responsibilities in this matter; and therefore she felt that the words of the resolution which were printed on the forms which had been distributed exactly expressed what was a very crying need, namely, that the young teachers, while they were being trained, should be shown the importance of the subject, and the practical way in which the difficulties occurring in it might be met.

PROFESSOR EDGAR said it had not been his intention to speak at this time, but it had appeared to him that most of the recent speeches had scarcely dealt with the real problem of eugenics; that most of them had rather dealt with questions of sex hygiene and the best way of bringing those matters before the young. He wished to make a practical suggestion: Would it not be possible for this society to draw up a dozen or so pedigrees well testified, representing, for example, the result of marriage between cousins, especially when they were of somewhat tainted stock, the result of marriage where the parents were alcoholic, and where there was a great tendency towards nervous instability and insanity; also a few normal pedigrees for comparison. Without any difficulty such pedigrees might very well be taken up and spoken of by teachers to children, especially from the age of 12 onwards. Thus children could be taught what dangers were ahead in the case of careless or thoughtless marriages; and, on the other hand, what results might be expected when marriages were wisely carried out. As a professor of education, who was mostly engaged in teaching those who would themselves be teachers, he had himself made a point of dealing with such pedigrees as were given in the Eugenics Society report of last summer. He hoped that in time his teacher-students might be able to outline such pedigrees, and in a natural manner bring eugenics before those whom they taught.

MISS MARCH (Lecturer on Sex Hygiene) said the question now being discussed by the conference was one she had taken a great interest in for some years; and she had been in correspondence with various American experimentalists, teachers who had dealt with the subject of sex hygiene chiefly, although in some cases they had worked on broader lines of eugenics in various types of schools and colleges. And she thought it might be helpful if she were to tell the meeting some of the things which these teachers had achieved. Miss Phelps, who had given a course of lectures on sex hygiene in her Normal Training College, told her, the speaker, in answer to an enquiry as to whether she had found that the instruction given had been sexually stimulating to the pupils, that in no case had there been such stimulation as a result of it. That lady included in her communication several letters she had received from her pupils after they had left the college and had had experience with children, and some of them after marriage, and they testified how helpful the instruction given had been. Mr. Beale, who was appointed

by the Education Authority at Ontario as Eugenics Lecturer, toured round the States visiting the schools, gave lectures on the subject, in some cases to boys and girls together, in others to the sexes separately, and he expressed himself well satisfied with the results he had obtained. Mrs. Barry, who presided over the committee which was appointed to investigate the methods of teaching sex hygiene, reported on 138 Normal Colleges at which the subject was taught; she also included a report from the Superintendent of the schools in Austin, Texas, where for three years sex hygiene was taught separately to boys and girls, and the statement made was that the moral atmosphere in the schools was much improved. A beginning was made with one lecture to girls, and one to boys, and there was considerable opposition from the parents. But the second year a request came from the parents for an extension of the course, and now these lectures held a recognised place in the ordinary school curriculum.

MR. JOHN RUSSELL (Headmaster, King Alfred School), in winding up the discussion, said that of those who were hostile to science and eugenics he was glad to say there had been none that morning. That attitude was often taken up in ignorance of the eugenic ideal, and need not detain them. Their concern was only with the difficulties realised by themselves. But before dealing with those difficulties he would like to re-state, as he understood it, the demand of the Eugenics Society. Its ultimate hope, still a very far-off one, was that no adolescent boys or girls should be allowed to leave school without having had the eugenic ideal set frankly and fully before them as an essential part of their moral, their human, education. That, the society fully realised, was a very big demand, involving, among other things, the timely instruction of all parents in the eugenic ideal and its implications, the timely instruction of boys and girls in sex knowledge, sex hygiene, especially, perhaps only, in the homes; and above all, timely instruction, nay, inspiration of all schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, particularly in training colleges, in the eugenic ideal itself. As to the methods, the society did not presume to dictate to practical teachers. It fully realised that the different types of school and the different types of men and women must be left to find their own methods of approach. But it earnestly hoped that some effective way might be found. As a schoolmaster he would like to express his own answer to the problem, and he thought it would be found to be the answer of most of those present who shared the Society's ideals; they would do what they could, and they certainly would not put the ideals away to be forgotten. But there was the obstacle of the unconvinced and the indifferent parent, the indifference of the man or woman in the street. He was sure he would be acquitted of vain-glory if he mentioned his own school. His relations with the parents of the pupils in his school were almost—not quite—unique. Yet he had hitherto failed to obtain their sanction, as a body, to any specific reference to the eugenic ideal. Many of the parents had encouraged him to have private talks with their children, many would allow him to do whatever his own judgment dictated as best; but others emphatically disapproved, and as a consequence many of the children under his care remained uninstructed in matters of sex, unless in unholy ways. But he proposed to go on calling his children's parents together, and trying to win them, as a body, to his ways. At

such meetings he had always been his own eugenic mouthpiece, though he was sure that where help was desired, the society would gladly send speakers. Prejudice still remained, in spite of all that had been said, and that he regarded as the only really serious difficulty. The difficulty was one of ignorance: as we knew more we should do better. Till that difficulty was removed—and it would die very hard—little could be done directly, and practically nothing collectively. But individually and indirectly they could achieve, if not the whole, at all events the greater part, of their purpose. Mr. Badley, in his admirable paper, had told the meeting how. The distinction which Mr. Badley drew between the science and art of the growing of the child and the science and art of the breeding of the child, seemed to bring out in the sharpest manner the function of the schoolmaster and the function of the eugenicist, functions which, surely, were not incompatible. Was not the chief function of the conference to establish their interdependence? to encourage each other, as schoolmasters, to believe that their own particular function would be but imperfectly performed unless it were informed with the spirit of the other? To grow children aright was one of the hardest and noblest tasks, and one of the gravest of responsibilities. But before they could be grown aright, they must be sown aright, and that was harder, nobler, and graver still. For the latter there were three essentials: the sower, the seed, and good ground. To see that each of these was the best of its kind, was not that the cardinal doctrine of eugenics? Was it not also the cardinal doctrine of education? For what purpose did the schools exist? Not only to make happy, serviceable human lives now, but also to fill the earth with happy and serviceable human lives hereafter. No man liveth unto himself or unto his day. According as one fulfilled or neglected one's duty towards one's neighbour (living or unborn) one was quickening or delaying the evolution of beauty and goodness. The laws of physical parenthood were no less essential to beautiful human life, no less to be honoured as humanities, than the laws of spiritual parenthood; and it was equally the highest task of the schools to teach them. Those boys and girls who wrecked their lives (or their children's lives) through sensuality were not solely responsible, they were rather victims of the ignorance and indifference of the men and women who had guided their young lives. Standing at the bar of his own conscience, he could not, as a schoolmaster, plead wholly guilty, nor yet wholly not guilty. For all moral failure they, as teachers, were largely responsible; for sex-failure no less, perhaps by reason of their timorousness more, than for all other. There existed no sure and certain safeguard, direct or indirect; but direct approach was sometimes open to some of them, while the hundred ways of indirect approach were open to all. Of these, the most natural and most effective must be the inspiration of their own education, and their own personal devotion to sex ideals.

(This terminated the morning session.) 22
